

-5-

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Support for the amendment can be found throughout the specification and on at least page 5, lines 12-23 and page 9, lines 1-8. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

On March 23, 2005, the restriction and claims were discussed with the Examiner. No agreement was reached.

Claims 1-8 and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Garrison et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Garrison does not set forth the structural limitations in claim 1 of a handle coupling having an opening, the handle coupling mounted with the holder body to couple the holder body to a handle having a tip, the opening in the handle coupling being moveable between a lock position where the handle tip engages the opening and an unlock position where the handle tip is released from the opening. Thus, Garrison does not anticipate claim 1, and the claims depending from claim 1. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) rejection of claims 1-8 and 10-20 as being anticipated by Garrison et al is requested.

Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garrison et al. in view of Rhee et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Three criteria must be met to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference, or combination of references, must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2142.

As discussed above, Garrison does not set forth the structural limitations in claim 1 of a handle coupling having an opening, the handle coupling mounted with the holder body to couple the holder body to a handle having a tip, the opening in the handle coupling

-6-

being moveable between a lock position where the handle tip engages the opening and an unlock position where the handle tip is released from the opening. Rhee does not supply the deficiency. The additional limitations of the dependent claims are considered patentable in combination with the limitations of the independent claims. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) rejection of claims 1-8 and 10-20 as being obvious over Garrison et al and Rhee is requested.

In view of the amendments and reasons provided above, it is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early allowance of all pending claims.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicant's attorney of record, Hallie A. Finucane at 612-330-0587.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: Hallie A. Finucane
Hallie A. Finucane, Reg. No. 33,172
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

HAF:lms